

EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE USE OF A STRUCTURED RECORDING
FORM IN THE METHODS OF SOCIAL GROUP WORK
AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

BY
DARLEEN LOIS SHEARER

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

AUGUST 1967

R-IV

P. 54

443-100

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere thanks to Mr. Turk and Mr. Lloyd Yarborough, my thesis advisors, for their tireless assistance and expert direction in the preparation of this thesis. In addition I am deeply indebted to Mr. Robert Shrider, Executive Director of the Bethlehem Community Center, and the entire staff for their cooperation and careful criticism of the structured recording form.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	1
Recording Defined	
Importance of Records	
Recording as a Problem Area	
A Recording Form	
II. METHODOLOGY	16
Purpose of the Study	
Definition of Terms and Concepts	
Procedure, Scope, and Limitations	
Description of the Sample	
III. PRESENTATION OF DATA	22
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	43
Conclusions	
Summary	
APPENDIX I	55
APPENDIX II	60
APPENDIX III	64
BIBLIOGRAPHY	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Experience within the Social Work Field	23
2. Experience with Bethlehem Community Center	23
3. Levels of Education of Respondents	24
4. Are You Working with at Least One Group at the Time of This Study?	24
5. Were You Able to Record a Meeting Using the Form?	25
6. Recording Time Required to Use the Form	25
7. Did You Have Difficulty Understanding What Infor- mation was being Sought on the Form?	27
8. Is the Recording Form Too Detailed?	29
9. Which Sections of the Form Would You Change? . . .	30
10. Would Using the Form Help You Work with Groups? .	33
11. Would Using the Form Facilitate the Organization of Your Records?	33
12. Did Using the Form Help You to Focus on:	34
13. Would Using the Form Aid You in Evaluating:	36
14. How Would You Change the Form?	39
15. Why Would You Like to Use the Form?	40
16. How do You Think Using the Form Would Affect Supervision?	42

CHAPTER I

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The social work profession today is far advanced over that of the past. With the years the image of its practitioners has changed from the "lady bountiful" to that of a skilled professional worker trained to use himself as a tool in helping people to help themselves. The social worker has acquired many skills through his working experiences and as a result of his quest for knowledge. He has, of course, encountered many problems. One area which has long been recognized as a problem in the field of social work is that of recording.

Recording Defined

Speaking very generally, recording is seen as an essential factor in social work for it is a means of maintaining facts about cases, groups, and communities, and a means of preserving situations which may not occur again. Due to the many kinds of facts and many different situations which require recording, social welfare agencies have developed many recording forms. Anne Lindsay, of Wayne University School of Social Work, in her book, Group Work Recording, takes note of the many kinds of fact-maintaining records which agencies may keep, and the importance of these to the

profession.

There is that vast area of statistical recording, kept on multiple forms, and used for numerical accounting. There are records on materials used, money expended, and persons served. Records are kept by agencies on the national, local, departmental, group, and individual levels. There are many types of narrative reports used for interpretation, information, experimentation - and even at times for justification! . . . These records which are primarily required for purposes of agency administration or interpretation . . .¹ are vital to every agency and necessarily time-consuming.

Recording which "preserves situations" is referred to as process recording. This may more formally be defined as follows:

. . . the written description of the dynamic interaction that has taken place in an interview. This description of the interaction is expected to contain factual information, worker observations, and an account of both the client's and the worker's responses and activity. The recording is expanded . . . , to encompass a detailed analysis of the worker's observations of, and reactions to, the interview - an analysis² that includes his diagnostic thinking and planning.

Process recording is used by practitioners in the three methods of social work - casework, group work, and community organization, and although it varies to some degree among the three methods, it has the same purpose - improving the quality of experience for the client, the group, or the community. Unlike fact-maintaining records, process records are usually quite detailed and extensive. For the beginning or untrained worker a process recording may lack structure. However, it

¹Anne Lindsay, Group Work Recording (New York: Woman's Press, 1952), p. 1.

²Margaret Dwyer and Martha Urbanowski, "Student Process Recording: A Plea for Structure," Social Casework, XXXXVI (May, 1965), p. 283.

is designed for the major purpose of improving the quality of experience which is provided for a person(s), as it is to be used as a tool in aiding the worker to understand the person(s) with whom he is working and to learn how to help them. For the group worker and community organizer, the content of such a recording consists of sections describing behavior of individuals in the group, the interaction of the members' minds, the role of the worker, the movement, growth, and change occurring in the members and in the group as a whole, and the relations of the group with the community.³

Importance of Records

Only through analyzing the process records of a group is it possible to adequately assess the movement of the group, to distinguish individual behavior patterns, to recall details and maintain a semblance of objectivity while assessing one's own role in the social work process. Harleigh B. Trecker, Dean and Professor of Social Work, University of Connecticut, speaks of the importance of records to the worker as follows:

Process records show the worker the variety of patterns of interpersonal relationships which take shape within the group. The emergence of a group consciousness can be seen as can subgroupings. The acceptance of the individual by the group is reflected by his change in status which can be discovered from reading accumulated records. The development of the worker's relationship and role can be ascertained from careful recording of what he does while helping the group. Attention becomes focused upon the status of the group in the agency and in the community as intergroup relations are recorded.

³Harleigh B. Trecker, Social Group Work (New York: Whiteside, Inc., 1955), p. 203.

Changes in the goals of the group become more evident, and member interests outside the group are seen from a review of the record.

As the worker writes his records after each meeting, he develops a picture of the group that can be passed on to his superior. Together, worker and supervisor can focus their attention on the group situation as experienced by the worker. The record is thus a stimulus to interaction between the supervisor and the worker. Records enable group work supervisors to keep in touch with many groups for purposes of coordinating the total program of the agency. Records are useful as a basis for evaluating the group experience of the members and for helping the worker in individual and group supervisory conferences. In worker evaluation records are indispensable. When new workers are assigned to groups, past records become useful at the point of orientation and help new workers to understand the kind of experience the group has enjoyed prior to the coming of the new worker. Records are valuable to other departments of the agency if it is large; and they are important in the planning of referrals of individuals to community resource agencies.⁴

Recording also facilitates planning. Details about meetings can be easily forgotten thus carefully kept records are essential for successful follow-through and planning for future meetings. Only through the records of what the worker does is it possible to learn, to evaluate, and to advance other techniques for use in social work. Carefully written records can serve as a basis for research and thereby the advancement of the social work profession with the knowledge resulting from the research. For example, a thorough examination and comparison of workers' records of adult groups trying to focus on problems of neighborhoods could be used to test hypotheses concerned with techniques to employ in gaining understanding and cooperation among the members.

⁴Ibid., pp. 199-200.

Thus in summarizing the importance of process recording, the following list⁵ of functions served can be compiled:

1. Tends to improve the quality of experience provided for a person.
2. Aids the worker in recognizing individual behavior patterns of group members.
3. Aids in recognizing and assessing the movement of the group as a whole and within the community.
4. Maintains and organizes facts about a group, such as attendance.
5. Aids in discerning the relationships of the members with each other.
6. Helps in recognizing the interaction of ideas.
7. Aids in the process of supervision of the worker.
8. Tends to increase the worker's self-awareness.
9. Aids in the coordination of the total program of the agency.
10. Facilitates evaluation of the group experience of members.
11. Aids in evaluating the worker.
12. Helps in the orientation of a new worker to a group.
13. Aids in the planning of referrals.
14. Facilitates planning program with the group and the individual planning of the worker.
15. Increases the potential for research and thereby the advancement of knowledge in social work.
16. Provides a substance for accounting to the public of how money is used.

Recording as a Problem Area

Although recording is considered an essential factor

⁵This list of process recording functions evolved from Trecker, op. cit., pp. 199-200.

it has long been a problem in the field of social work.⁶ Early in the 1950's there was a resurgent interest in the area of recording by authorities in social casework. The Social Welfare Forum of 1953 saw the presentation of the findings of a time-cost study conducted at Family Service of Philadelphia. Mr. John G. Hill, research director of the study, stated that of every \$100 spent by the agency, \$27 was for the cost of recording.⁷ Thus recording costs mounted to about one-third the cost of giving services to clients.⁸

Other problems concerning recording also came to the surface with the publication of a number of articles in various social work and related journals. Dr. Charlotte Babcock in her article, "Social Work as Work," brought attention to the many problem areas faced by a caseworker. Foremost in her discussion of anxiety-producing situations faced by caseworkers in typical work settings was "recording". She found in her treatment of caseworkers and supervisors that failing at recording was often a result of feelings of inadequacy or of not being knowledgeable. Recording the process of social work with a client served to increase the worker's anxiety feelings as he saw more clearly through his

⁶A. R. Merrifield, "New Recording System for Medical Settings," Social Casework, XXXXI (May, 1960), p. 257.

⁷John Frings, "Experimental Systems of Recording," Social Casework, XXVIII (February, 1957), p. 55.

⁸"Of Records and Supervision," Social Service Review, XXVIII (March, 1954), p. 83.

recordings the mistakes he was making.⁹ These two problem areas were commented upon again in 1954 in the "Notes and Comments" section of the Social Service Review.

One of the most common causes of occupational neurosis among social workers is recording. Its impact produces a variety of symptoms, from mutism to verbigeration, from headache to laryngitis, from hyperactivity on all fronts to frozen depression in the face of the enemy Ediphone. And . . . to complicate . . . the problem is the matter of cost That social agency records are costly is a fact long known, but it is startling to face the exact figure - thirty-two cents out of every service dollar - and a proportion to stun a supporting community, to harrow board member and administrator, and to traumatize the already record-ridden caseworker, for now, indeed, his words must be pearls! It is a figure and a proportion to command all casework agency staff members to consider ways and means of solving this costly problem.¹⁰

Time is proposed as another problem faced in recording in the paper "Experimental Systems of Recording," by John Frings. Director of the Study of Recording carried on by the United Charities of Chicago and the Jewish Family and Community Service of Chicago, he presented his paper at the Biennial Meeting of the Family Service Association of America in Cincinnati, Ohio, November 17, 1956. Testing the experimental systems of recording, each requiring less recording on a case than the first one, he found that recording is related to the amount of time available for recording and to what can be produced in the recording.

It would seem that in usual practice, depending on the various pressures and demands, certain cases are selected for recording at any one time and this recording is done

⁹Charlotte G. Babcock, M.D., "Social Work as Work," Social Casework, XXV (December, 1953), pp. 415-422.

¹⁰"Of Records and Supervision," op. cit.

more or less currently, while other cases go unrecorded for varying lengths of time. The result is that there is generally a lag in the worker's recording of the total caseload and, since this is probably cumulative, more and more selectivity is necessary, the longer the caseload, as a whole, is unrecorded.¹¹

Mr. Frings also noted a problem of a lack of structure. He found that the caseworker who wrote the records, felt a real need for a spelling out of what was wanted in the record, how much, and how it should be organized. The difficulty with the detailed recording centered around the lack of structure. Although the worker adapted himself to reasonable expectations, he reacted negatively when he did not see the relation of the expectations to the practical usage of what he was producing, and/or when he did not understand clearly what was expected of him. As a result, a wide difference of opinion was revealed between the caseworker, and the supervisor who used the records. The producers, or caseworkers, were satisfied with brief recording, if there was a need for any at all, whereas, the users, or supervisors, preferred detailed recording at all times. Mr. Frings, however, concluded that a method of recording is possible which would be realistic to the time allotted for recording and which would produce the "greatest general professional return to the staff".¹²

Thus we see from the literature in casework during the 1950's an interest in recording and a depicting of at least four major problem areas within recording - cost, anxiety of the worker, time, and a lack of structure. But

¹¹Frings, op. cit., p. 60.

¹²Ibid., p. 62.

recognizing a problem and finding a solution for it are two different things. This can be verified with the emergence in the literature of the 1960's of the same problems.

A. F. Merrifield in 1960, writing about a new recording system used by the Department of Medical Social Work at the University of Illinois Research and Educational Hospitals, draws attention to the long recognized problem of recording and sees recording as a hindrance to the worker unless its purpose is understood and its method simplified. He also notes the factor of pressures on the worker to produce the records as not conducive to good recording.¹³ Again in 1965, the periodical, Social Casework, reveals ". . . A Plea for Structure".¹⁴ This time the concern is with student process recording, but a statement in the article strongly suggests that trained workers also feel the problems of recording. ". . . Most trained workers confess they are not adept in recording, and feel considerable resistance to it."¹⁵ Students, when they become agency staff members, find that ". . . recording continues to consume a disproportionate amount of their time, with the not infrequent result, that they try to escape from this reality by postponing it until it has reached unmanageable proportions."¹⁶

If one considers the average work load of a group worker, or a community organizer, wherein they come in contact with

¹³Merrifield, op. cit., pp. 254-257.

¹⁴Dwyer, and Urbanowski, op. cit., p. 284.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid.

many individuals seeking assistance, and many groups for whom they are responsible, it is quite conceivable that process recording of the form attributable to Harleigh B. Trecker, is unrealistic to the amount of time available to the worker. The problems felt in casework recording in the 1950's were also present in community organization. Campbell G. Murphy, in 1959, writing on recording for community organization stated -

In community organization practice, record keeping on the whole is in a primitive stage. A very practical problem is that the wide range of activities in which the community organization worker is engaged would require a tremendous amount of recording if anything realistic regarding the 'process' or 'movement' or 'relationship' were to be properly recorded.¹⁷

C. F. McNeil, writing in 1954, had earlier pointed to the expense and time factors of process recording, and had also noted that process recording for community organization was still in the experimental stages, but felt that with wider application, there would be better understanding of it.¹⁸ Wayne McMillen, even earlier in 1945, however, had taken a slightly differing view. He felt that the process of community organization could be carried successfully forward only by being constantly related to the sources of factual material, and thus there was a great need for adequate and controlled recording. He defined controlled recording as that within

¹⁷Campbell G. Murphy, "Community Organization Recording," Community Organization in Action, (New York: Association Press, 1959), p. 303.

¹⁸C. F. McNeil, "Community Organization for Social Welfare," Social Work Yearbook 1954, XII (1954), pp. 121-128.

which there was uniformity regarding the definition of terms and certain key items previously agreed upon.¹⁹ Thus process recording is seen as cumbersome, expensive, and time-consuming to some of the authorities in the community organization method, and they seem to be in agreement on the need for systematic, controlled, or structured recording. This compares with the findings of Frings and the article, "Process Recording: A Plea for Structure," which have been previously mentioned.

Experiments with brief recording conducted by social workers in the casework method have revealed that the case-load of a worker can be increased and still the worker will be happy and efficient. With the relief from detailed recording there developed a different orientation to the total job, and production increased.²⁰ There also developed, however, problems with supervision in verbally conveying the material, particularly when a case was in its initial stages or the material was complex. However, it was felt that these difficulties were offset as they required the worker and supervisor to develop a greater sense of partnership, sharpen their respective responsibilities, and increase their communication.²¹

¹⁹Wayne McMillen, Community Organization for Social Welfare (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), p. 221.

²⁰Nathaniel Goodman, "The Use of the Movement Scale With Brief Recording," Social Casework, XXXIX (May, 1958), pp. 282-286.

²¹Wilda J. Dailey and Virginia Pettit Hogan, "Brief Recording and Supervision," Social Casework, XXXIX (May, 1958), pp. 278-282.

Looking at the prolonged period of expressed problem areas with process recording, one begins to question why seemingly no alternative form of recording has been devised or brought to the attention of the social casework, social group work, and community organization methods. The examination of the purposes of process recording and its problems would not seem to eliminate the possibility, by means of another form of recording, of attaining the purposes and decreasing or eliminating the problems.

A Recording Form

While engaged in a block field placement in community organization, the researcher became aware of the limitations of process recording to the social work process. Drawing upon past recording experiences with a recording form at South Side Settlement in Columbus, Ohio, and knowledge of the purposes and importance of the process record, the researcher devised a recording form designed to meet the needs of the worker in community organization or group work. Recording for casework was not considered as the researcher is primarily interested, and most familiar, with community organization and group work. Also it was felt that casework recording would vary greatly among agencies.

The recording form which was devised by the student consisted of sections to elicit information much like Trecker saw as necessary to the development of the worker and of the group. This information was as follows:

1. Factual information of attendance, date, time and

place of the meeting, and subjects discussed by the group.

2. Roles taken by various members and the interaction of the members with each other.
3. The role of the worker with individuals and with the group as a whole.
4. The movement of the group in the community and its relation to other community organizations.
5. General and specific plans of the group and of the worker.

Correlating the functions served by process recording (Refer to page 5 of the text.) and the above sections of the recording form will reveal them to be very similar. The recording form (hereafter referred to as "form") was designed for the recording of group meetings such as clubs, committees, neighborhood councils, and so forth.

There are a number of features about the form which the researcher felt would suggest its successful use by agencies. The structure of the form is such as to facilitate organization of workers' records. Space is allotted for the group's name, the worker's name, identifying characteristics about the group, date of the meeting, and the number of the recording on the group. Because of its layout with direct questions to be answered by the recorder, the form demands selectivity and exactness in the recording. The structured questions require the worker to record certain events that occur in a meeting. Frings and Dwyer and Urbanowski, noted that recording often "piled up" and then resulted in a great deal of selectivity on the part of the recorder. Use of the form would greatly limit this selectivity and demand more

exactness in the writing because of the limited space provided for recording. Terms used in the form, such as those describing the tone of the meeting, (Refer to Appendix I, page 55.) increase uniformity of records among agencies, and increase communication between supervisor and worker as they discuss the definition of terms.

As the researcher examined the form she began to raise questions concerning it. Would the form in actuality increase the amount of time needed for recording? Was it too simple or perhaps not clear enough? Would the beginning worker or indigenous worker find ease of use with it? Was it too structured, thereby limiting creativeness of the recorder? Would the structured form aid in the reduction of anxiety on the part of the worker? Would the form aid the worker in seeing more clearly his role with the group, and in understanding the group dynamics, thereby increasing the worker's level of awareness? How could the form be changed to make it a more effective tool for the worker? What would be its effect upon supervision? Was the form flexible enough to be used by different agencies? Would use of the form facilitate the organization of a worker's records?

The answers to these questions, which would disclose the possibility of employing the form, lay with people who were acquainted with the form. The researcher felt that once their opinions were gathered, conclusions could be drawn, and the form could then be altered where needed, thereby increasing the worker's ability to make use of it. The effectiveness

of the form could then be tested in meeting the criteria of a recording.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this exploratory study in the area of social work recording is to determine the possibilities of employing "the structured recording form," which has been examined on pages 12 through 14 of the text, in the methods of social group work and community organization.

Definition of Terms and Concepts

Certain terms and concepts are used throughout this with which the reader may be unfamiliar. For the purposes of clarification they are defined as follows:

Recording form -- varying greatly among social welfare agencies, this is usually a suggested, or required, means of maintaining records on groups. It differs in the amount of suggested structure, but is often a schedule upon which one records, answering questions therein raised by the form.

Community organization -- one of the three methods of social work, it ". . . is the process of working with people so that they will realize their potential to act, in regard to their surroundings and the community in which they live, in changing their environment to

satisfy them, the people." This definition places its emphasis upon the people and the process of working with them through their involvement in the process, and of affecting change in relation to their surroundings and the community.²²

Social group work -- one of the three methods of social work, it is ". . . a process and a method through which group life is affected by a worker who consciously directs the interacting process toward the accomplishment of goals which in our country are conceived in a democratic frame of reference."²³

Indigenous worker -- an individual employed with a social agency, who may or may not have a formal educational degree. He knows the problems with which he is working because being a member of the community in which he works, he also faces them.²⁴

Beginning worker -- an individual with a college degree who is employed with a social agency but with less than two years experience with the agency.

Supervisor -- an individual within the social agency whose role it is, because of his knowledge, understanding,

²²Darleen Shearer, "Community Organization: Definition," (Atlanta, Georgia: Atlanta University, 1966), Unpublished.

²³Gertrude Wilson and Gladys Ryland, Social Group Work (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949), p. 61.

²⁴The Indigenous Nonprofessional, Report Number 3 (New York: National Institute of Labor Education Mental Health Program, November, 1964).

and experience, to enable workers to increase their competence as staff members.²⁵

Procedure, Scope, and Limitations

In order to secure workers' opinions of the form and thereby determine the possibilities of its implementation, the researcher decided to have workers use the form and then, using a questionnaire, assess their opinions of it.

The interview consisted of reading the questions to the subject and noting his responses on the interview schedule. The researcher used the interview rather than the questionnaire because of the greater flexibility it permitted in the interview situation, for example, in rephrasing questions or probing to clarify the meaning of the interviewee's responses. Nevertheless most of the questions were standardized. Also the interview allows the interviewer to create a more receptive atmosphere than that created when the respondent is asked to fill out a four page questionnaire.

The administration of the interview takes time on the part of the interviewer and the respondent. The development of an open atmosphere to elicit free expression requires time, as does the administration of the open-ended questions which are designed to permit the free expression of the respondent.²⁶

Considering the factor of interviewing time and the objective of the exploratory study being that of identifying

²⁵Wilson and Ryland, op. cit., pp. 533-586.

²⁶Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: The Dryden Press, 1951), Part I, pp. 157-158.

preliminary hypotheses in areas which have limited development, the researcher felt that it would be possible to select from one agency, a sample to use the form as concern was focused upon the degree of educational training and practical experience of the workers rather than upon the number of workers in the sample.

Flexibility and ease of use of the form could only be determined after eliciting opinions from workers of varying experience. The opinions of supervisors and workers would both be needed for adequate testing of the effect of the form on the worker's anxiety around recording and its effect, if any, on his awareness of how he uses himself as a tool in working with people. Also they would both be needed to deduce whether there would be a difference between the workers and supervisors concerning how much material needed to be recorded. In view of these factors an agency with two or more supervisors and a sizable staff of varying backgrounds of experience seemed most appropriate for the testing of the form. The functions of the agency also entered into the selection process. As the form was specifically designed for community organization workers and social group workers, an agency involved in both methods would provide the best staff for the testing of the form. Thus, the criteria for selecting an agency was as follows:

1. The size of the staff and their experience
2. The number of supervisors
3. The functions of the agency

Bethlehem Community Center of Atlanta, Georgia, appeared to offer the best resources for the study. The staff of fifteen persons consists of five full-time workers, three part-time workers, four field work students of the Atlanta University School of Social Work, one full-time janitor, one part-time janitor, and one full-time secretary. The agency, although principally group work oriented, delves into many aspects of the community life, as it believes that in order to work with the whole person, one must also deal with the environment in which the person lives.

Bethlehem Community Center shall seek to achieve a community of well-being by developing racial understanding, and enriching the social, recreational, educational, cultural, and spiritual resources of the people in the neighborhood(s) it serves. In so doing, its services shall be focused upon the neighborhood(s) and shall be non-denominational in scope.²⁷

Another contributing factor is that the staff for the past six months has been experimenting with recording, trying to devise a form which would be agreeable to them and meet their needs. The Executive Director, Mr. Robert Shrider, was very pleased when the researcher approached him with the idea of testing the form with the staff, as he felt that this could possibly help them to clarify their own thinking, or might even be the answer for them.

Making use of only one agency in selecting the sample was a limit to the study in spite of the advantages of Bethlehem Community Center. This decreased the possibility

²⁷Bethlehem Community Center, "Charter and Bylaws," (Atlanta, Georgia: Bethlehem Community Center, February, 1965), Revised, p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

of differences of opinions among various agencies which would be of differing social work methods. Also by selecting one agency the sample size was decreased. Another major limitation of the study was that the members of the sample all had at least a college degree, thus ease of use of the form for the indigenous worker of little academic background could not be tested. The researcher, aware of these limitations, however, felt that the necessity of meeting thesis deadlines and the exploratory nature of the study justified the use of one agency and a sample of ten staff members.

Description of the Sample

The researcher decided upon ten members of the staff for the sample. These ten people consisted of three full-time supervisors of more than five years experience with the agency, four workers with less than two years experience of which three were beginning social group work students of the Atlanta University School of Social Work, and three workers of more than two years experience with the agency. These ten people were chosen on the basis of the amount of experience that they had, the position they held with the agency, and the kinds of groups with which they were working.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The presentation of data will follow the grouping of the staff which was explained on page 20, "Description of the Sample" and the sections of the interview schedule. This will facilitate individual members remaining anonymous and also enable better comprehension of the material. In the sections of the interview schedule dealing with "aspects of a meeting which you usually record" and "which you feel should be recorded", all respondents tended to discuss changes they would make in the form. In view of this and the priority of clarity to the writing, the researcher integrated this section with that on "changes".

The members of the sample were originally selected on the basis of the amount of experience with the agency, the agency position they held, and the kinds of groups with which they were working. The following tables reveal other characteristics of the workers which had bearing upon their expressed opinions of the form.

Table 1 indicates that six persons in the sample had more than six years of experience within the field of social work. Actual compilation of years reveals a total of thirty-seven for the three supervisors, nine and a half years for the four Group B members and twenty-eight years for the three

Group C members. Thus workers of Group B with the least amount of experience in the social work field also had less than two years experience with the agency, Bethlehem Community Center.

TABLE 1
EXPERIENCE WITHIN THE SOCIAL WORK FIELD

Groups ^a	Number of Months						
	0-11	12-23	24-35	36-47	48-59	60-71	72 and over
A	3
B	1	..	1	1	1
C	3
Total	1	..	1	1	1	..	6

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

TABLE 2
EXPERIENCE WITH BETHLEHEM COMMUNITY CENTER

Groups	Number of Months						
	0-11	12-23	24-35	36-47	48-59	60-71	72 and over
A	3
B	3	1
C	1	2
Total	3	1	1	5

Years of experience cannot necessarily be equated with level of formal education as Table 3 reveals. Workers

of Group C with twenty-eight years of experience have less formal education than the Group B members with fewer than two years of experience with the agency.

TABLE 3
LEVELS OF EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

Groups ^a	Levels of Education			
	B.A. Degree	Adv. Study	Grad. Study	M.S.W.
A	..	1	..	2
B	4	..
C	1	1	1	..
Total	1	2	5	2

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

TABLE 4
ARE YOU WORKING WITH AT LEAST ONE GROUP
AT THE TIME OF THIS STUDY?

Groups	Responses	
	Yes	No
A	2	1
B	4	..
C	3	..
Total	9	1

Table 4 indicates that only one of the ten respondents was not working with a group at the time of the study.

Table 5 shows that only two people were unable to record a meeting using the form. The researcher was fully assured by the two individuals, both supervisors, that they had acquainted themselves with the form.

TABLE 5

WERE YOU ABLE TO RECORD A MEETING USING THE FORM?

Groups ^a	Responses	
	Yes	No
A	1	2
B	4	..
C	3	..
Total	8	2

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

TABLE 6

RECORDING TIME REQUIRED TO USE THE FORM

Groups	Time Periods in Minutes			
	30 Min.	45 Min.	60 Min.	90 Min.
A	..	2	..	1
B	..	4
C	3	..
Total	..	6	3	1

Table 6 indicates that two of the supervisors stated that they usually spend thirty minutes recording a meeting,

and found the form required approximately forty-five minutes. Neither felt that the form required too much time. As one supervisor commented, "There would be less time after it becomes routine." The supervisor who was not working with a group at the time of the study felt that it usually required ninety minutes to record a meeting. This length of time concurred with her approximation of time needed for the form. She felt that this was too much time in relation to her goal of a minimum of sixty minutes for recording a meeting.

The members of Group B were slow to react to the question of time usually spent recording a meeting and hesitated to give a period of time. However, all of the four workers found the form required approximately forty-five minutes, and agreed that this was not too much time in relation to the amount of time they would like to spend on a recording.

As with the last group discussed, the researcher found the members of Group C very reluctant to state the number of minutes they usually spent recording a meeting. The three workers gave thirty minutes as an ideal length of time to be spent recording a meeting. Interestingly enough, although each person took at least sixty minutes to record a meeting using the form, each one quickly added that the time would decrease as he became familiar with the form. Some added to this comment, "I liked it."

Table 7 shows that most of the participants of the study had difficulty understanding what information was being sought on the form. Those few who did not express difficulty possessed the Master of Social Work Degree.

TABLE 7

DID YOU HAVE DIFFICULTY UNDERSTANDING WHAT
INFORMATION WAS SOUGHT ON THE FORM?

Groups ^a	Responses	
	Yes	No
A	1	2
B	4	..
C	3	..
Total	8	2

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

The supervisors took divergent viewpoints in answering the question, "Did you have difficulty understanding what information was sought on the form?" Two said that generally they had no difficulty. The other supervisor stated, from workers' reactions to her as a supervisor, that there was some difficulty. Confusion existed over the researcher's definition of terms. An example of some of the confusion was the difference between "hostility" and "conflict" referred to in sections VII and VIII of the form. The supervisor suggested that an orientation to the form by the staff would eliminate or decrease some of this difficulty.

The ability of Group B members to understand what information was sought seemed to be greatly affected by the terminology. Representative of Group B's comments is the following: "I didn't understand what you [the researcher]

wanted." In some instances comments were made regarding repetition of sections of the form. The researcher, upon probing, felt that again it was a matter of definition of terms. Two individuals suggested that an orientation to the form before using it would be very profitable.

The interviews with members of Group C moved smoothly until they were asked if they had difficulty understanding what information was sought on the form. Once this question was raised their resistance to recording became evident. Although the workers were enthusiastic about the form as a whole, they were also critical in their observations of the form. For example, each of the respondents went completely through the form pointing out sections which were not clear to him and raising questions about the meanings and differences of terms. "What's a benevolent ruler?" "Aren't sections seven and eight repetitious?" "Sections nine and eleven seem to be the same." One worker, with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture, stated that although he had difficulty understanding some of the form, he felt that this was because of his background. As with Group B, problems with understanding the form seemed to center on the definition of terms.

Table 8 indicates that six of the ten participants felt the form was too detailed. Examination of Table 9 reveals that this opinion applied to sections VI through XII which are items repeatedly asking the role of the worker in the situations being recorded. Within these sections the worker would most readily see his mistakes in working with the group.

TABLE 8
IS THE RECORDING FORM TOO DETAILED?

Groups ^a	Responses	
	Yes	No
A	1	2
B	1	3
C	4	..
Total	6	5

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

Two supervisors said that they did not feel the form was too detailed. Both, however, suggested some changes. Table 9 indicates those sections which they would change. One supervisor noted that section IX and XI, concerned with individuals who took the most active part and who took leadership, respectfully, should be combined. Another supervisor, looking at the form from the viewpoint of dealing with community meetings, stated that some of the sections would not be applicable. For instance, at a meeting of sixty people, a worker would have little concern for who was withdrawn. The third supervisor, who felt that the form was too detailed, did not, however, mention specific sections as did the others. Instead, to explain her comment of it being too detailed, she said, "I'd get tired of the same form over the weeks; there would be duplication."

TABLE 9
WHICH SECTIONS OF THE FORM WOULD YOU CHANGE?^a

Groups ^b	Sections								
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
A					2	2	2	2	2
B			1	1			1	1	1
C						1	3	1	3
Total			1	1	2	3	6	4	6

^aMembers of the various groups gave multiple responses to this question.

^bGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

TABLE 9--Continued

X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII
1	2							1
1		1						
3	2	2						
5	4	3						1

One worker of Group B felt that the form was too detailed, whereas three workers said it was not. The individual who gave the negative response, pointed out several sections which could be condensed. Following this comment, however, he stated, "It is not always easy to identify your role under these sections VII through XII . You should say 'comments' and/or 'role'." Later under another section the same individual commented that the form was so involved that he doubted if workers would use it after each meeting. (Sections VI through XII have items asking the role of the worker in the situation being recorded.)

All the members of Group C were in agreement that some sections of the form were repetitious, such as VII and VIII, which deal with the presence of conflict and hostility during the meeting; IX and XI, which are concerned with individuals who took the most active part and who took leadership during the meeting; and XII and IV, which refer to a feeling of being in a group and the group feeling more "togetherness" or less "togetherness", and suggested that these be combined. Here again, the issue of definition of terms entered.

Tables 10 and 11 show that all the staff members who participated in the study agreed that the form would help them in working with groups and would facilitate the organization of their records. Several comments were made by supervisors to the effect that use of the form enabled the worker to see patterns developing in the group members' behavior and that on the whole, the form helped him to see the value of recording.

TABLE 10

WOULD USING THE FORM HELP YOU WORK WITH GROUPS?

Groups ^a	Responses	
	Yes	No
A	3	..
B	4	..
C	3	..
Total	10	..

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

TABLE 11

WOULD USING THE FORM FACILITATE THE ORGANIZATION OF YOUR RECORDS?

Groups	Responses	
	Yes	No
A	3	..
B	4	..
C	3	..
Total	10	..

Many voluntary comments were made by Group B members expressing positive feelings toward the specificity of questions and the opportunity this afforded to pick out particular information. This enabled the worker to see his progress, and as one individual said, "It makes you look at all,

not just the outstanding features of a meeting."

One member of Group C commented that he got "... a better picture of the group." This person had also stated that he used section VI (which primarily deals with a list of the business items of the meeting) as a guide to write a narrative discussing the aspects listed, thereby recording the process, or dynamics, of the group.

TABLE 12

DID USING THE FORM HELP YOU TO FOCUS ON:

Individual Behavior Patterns?			Relations of Members?			
Groups ^a	Responses			Groups	Responses	
	Yes	No			Yes	No
A	3	..		A	..	3
B	3	1		B	3	1
C	3	..		C	3	..
Total	9	1		Total	6	4

Relations of Grp. to Community?			Planning of Fut. Meetings?			
Groups	Responses			Groups	Responses	
	Yes	No			Yes	No
A	..	3		A	2	1
B	1	3		B	3	1
C	..	3		C	3	..
Total	1	9		Total	8	2

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

Table 12 shows that the three supervisors agreed that using the form would help them to focus attention on individual behavior, and also shows that they agreed that the form would not help them focus on the relations of members to each other, nor in the relation of the group to the community. Concern was mentioned here by one person in regards to the researcher's intended meaning of "relation". Two supervisors agreed that the form would help focus on planning for future meetings with the group. The individual abstaining did so because the form lacked a section on "goals of the group meeting". However, one of the first respondents stated that he saw "goals" inherent in the section of the form calling for the "worker's plans for the next meeting."

There was a great deal of conflicting opinions among Group B members. Three of the four respondents felt the form helped them focus on individual behavior patterns. Three agreed that it would help them concentrate on the relations of members to each other. One worker who agreed, however had reservations, saying this was only apparent in the section of the form concerned with the existence of subgroups. Three workers stated that the form afforded little centering on the relation of the group to the community, whereas only one said it helped him to accomplish this. That the form helped to pinpoint planning for future meetings was agreed to be three members of Group B. One person, noting the absence of a section for the goals of a meeting, responded negatively to this question.

The workers of Group C agreed that the form helped them focus on the relations of the members to each other, on the behavior patterns of individual members, and on planning for future meetings. None felt that it helped them to focus on the relations of the group to the community. Some responded that one question on the form did bring to mind the community, but not that much. In relation to the aspect of planning for future meetings, one individual responded not so much in favor of the section of the form for writing of plans for the next meeting, as in favor of the form's detail. "By being more detailed, then I plan more so that I have more to write on the meeting."

TABLE 13

WOULD USING THE FORM AID YOU IN EVALUATING:

The Group's Movement?			Your Role?			
Groups ^a	Responses			Groups	Responses	
	Yes	No			Yes	No
A	3	..		A	3	..
B	4	..		B	3	1
C	3	..		C	3	..
Total	10	..		Total	9	1

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

Table 13 indicates that all of the supervisors were in agreement that the form would aid the worker in evaluating the group's movement and the worker's role.

Agreement prevailed in Group B in the section concerned with the form facilitating evaluation of the group's movement. One person, however, objected that it would not help him to evaluate his own role.

As with previous questions, the three workers of Group C concurred in their opinion that the form would aid them in evaluating the group's movement and their role. One person who expressed a great dislike for recording emphatically stated "Yes" to the form helping her to evaluate her own role and added that evaluating her role ". . . is a great lack of mine."

All members of the sample agreed that they would make changes in the form. Table 14, which depicts only major responses, reveals that the respondents made many comments and suggestions. The researcher has presented these in terms of how the form would look if all these suggestions and comments were implemented.

To eliminate bulkiness the recording form would be contained on both the front and the back of pages. An item pertaining to the weather conditions at the time of the meeting would be included within section I which contains fact-sheet items of the group and of the meeting. Section II, the attendance list, would be replaced with a separate attendance sheet in the group's file folder. Following section I would then be a section wherein the worker could write the purpose of the meeting and the goals for the meeting. Section III, which deals with the tone of the meeting, would be expanded

with the provision of more space for "comments" on the item. Section VI, the business items of the meeting, would be extended over two pages to allow for possible instructions from the supervisor for the worker to write more of the process that took place in the group, and an addition of an item for what activity, if any, was occurring while the subject was being discussed. This last addition would then permit recording on activity groups or a group having recreation. Also included would be an item calling for an evaluation of section VI. Sections IX and XI, which are concerned with the most active participant and the person taking leadership, would be combined, and the item "Comments" in section XIII, the role of the worker, changed to read "Evaluation." The worker's plans, section XVII, would be moved so that it became the last item on the recording form.

All of the sample members said that they would like to use the form with the provision that the changes they recommended were made. In answer to the question, "Why would you like to use it?", they gave numerous and various responses, as is indicated by Table 15.

The supervisors stated that the form gave direction to the recorder, fostering a recollection of information which is often forgotten or ignored. As one supervisor said, "Although some workers might leave this worker's role blank, it is still better than open-ended questions in which you would get such replies as, 'It was a good party. My role was that of making it good.'" The possibility was raised that

the structure of the form could also decrease the resistance to recording by diminishing the worker's anxiety. One supervisor stated that he would use the form for this reason. The line of thought, in recognition of the extent of staff members' resistance to recording, was that if this level of anxiety was reduced the workers could then begin to cultivate a positive view of recording. Two of the supervisors volunteered that they would like to use the form as an educational tool. As one stated, "Begin a worker on the form, and as he progressed move him to another form of recording."

TABLE 14
HOW WOULD YOU CHANGE THE FORM?

Responses	Groups ^a			
	A	B	C	Total
Add weather category	1	2	1	4
Add a separate attendance sheet	1	..	1	2
Add goals category	2	1	1	4
Add outstanding behavior category	..	1	..	1
Provide more space	2	..	2	4
Have an orientation	1	2	1	4
Provide for recording more group interaction	1	2	..	3
Add activity category	1	1
Put form on both sides of a page	1	..	1	2
Total	10	8	7	25

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

TABLE 15
WHY WOULD YOU LIKE TO USE THE FORM?

Responses	Groups ^a			
	A	B	C	Total
Afforded direction	2	2	3	7
Decreased recording resistance	1	2	2	5
Enabled abstracting of salient information	..	1	..	1
Saved time recording	..	2	1	3
Helped see the internal makeup of a group	..	1	1	2
Good educational tool	2	1	..	3
Total	5	9	7	21

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

The comments of Group B members centered around the form providing structure for the record, and thereby decreasing the recording time and resistance to recording. Another factor mentioned was that the required specificity enabled the worker to go back to the old records and quickly pull information that was needed. One worker stated that, although he liked the specificity required by the form, he felt that with a professional education he would automatically include these sections in his recordings, and therefore, felt the form was very good for unprofessional workers. Another individual felt that the form helped him to look at the internal makeup and dynamics of the group more. One student who was more involved with community organization

than the other workers seemed to summarize the Group's comments when he said,

"It's shorter. It enables you to specify a little more rather than covering generally. I think it would decrease a worker's hostility toward recording, and it would help with community group meetings because of the consistency and shortness it affords."

Comments of Group C members also centered around the structure, or direction provided by the form and the decreasing of resistance. As one group member stated,

"I despise recording; even when I have time I will sit and not know where to start. This form gave me direction. I am not sure if it would decrease resistance to recording for others, but it would lessen it for me. Really I would like just a check list, but my supervisor wouldn't, of course. It the form helps me to focus on the groups better."

Another worker in answer to this same question explained,

"It has more detail, bringing out things I don't usually bring out. You would look for things in the group because you knew you had to record them. I don't like to record, and I feel the time factor has a great deal to do with recording, but with this form the time would decrease the more you used it."

The remaining individual stated simply and clearly, "It gives me direction."

In answer to the question, "How do you think using the form would affect supervision?", Table 16 shows one supervisor, concerned with the length of the form, felt that supervision would tend to become boring. This person had not been able to use the form with any of the workers she supervised. The other supervisors, however, felt that using the form would make the supervisor's job easier, as he would be afforded directions in which to work with staff members.

TABLE 16
HOW DO YOU THINK USING THE FORM WOULD
AFFECT SUPERVISION?

Responses	Groups ^a			
	A	B	C	Total
Make it boring	1	1
Make it easier	1	1
Increase dialogue	1	4	3	8
Give supervisor direction	1	1	..	2
Total	4	5	3	12

^aGroup A refers to supervisors; Group B to workers with less than two years experience; and Group C to workers with more than two years experience with Bethlehem.

Three of the four workers of Group B felt that using the form would be good for supervision because it would increase the dialogue between supervisors and workers as they discussed the meaning of terms, and the meaning of attitudes and behavior revealed in the form.

Although, the issue of the effect of the form upon supervision was not discussed to any great extent, all Group C members felt that discussion in supervision sessions would be increased.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

With the cooperation of the staff of Bethlehem Community Center, the researcher was able to conduct the ten interviews within four days. These interviews took place either in the staff member's office or in the staff lounge at the agency. The interviews ranged from twenty to sixty minutes, depending upon the staff member's feelings regarding the recording form.

Those persons who exhibited a strong dislike for recording tended to require the longest period of time for an interview. They were also much more spontaneous with comments regarding the form than were staff members who related that they recognized the need for recording. Those who disliked recording were seemingly so excited about their opinions of the form that they tended to answer questions on the interview schedule before the researcher had asked the question. As a result many of the interviews bordered on discussions about the form and recording, and the researcher found herself in the position of having to set limits on the period of time for interviews.

On the whole, while interviewing, the researcher, found the ten staff members of Bethlehem Community Center,

to be very receptive to the research effort. A great deal of enthusiasm was expressed for the experience of working with the structured recording form, although opinions differed regarding the form. The members of the study group felt they had learned something from experimenting with the form. Some now recognized specific aspects of group meetings which they had not been recording and which had caused them problems in supervision as they had not fully understood what was being requested of them. Others felt a greater sense of confidence as they distinguished sections of the form which were unclear, redundant, or not needed at all. Where before some staff members had considered recording "a bother", "just taking up time", they now saw it as a tool which could greatly help them in working with groups.

The reaction of enthusiasm on the part of the staff was interesting, particularly because of several negative responses received when the recording forms were first dispensed and the purpose of the research explained. Thumbing through the five pages of the form, one person in a disgusted manner said, "I can tell you right now it is not going to be good because it is too long." Another person in a shocked questioning tone, asked, "Is this all of it?" One other person took a differing viewpoint for his initial reason for disliking the form. As he told me during the interview - "I didn't like it and was not going to use it just because you made it up. You're a woman; that's why I didn't like it." These very same people in the interviews following use of the

form expressed amazement over the small amount of time required to record on the form, and continued by explaining that the time would decrease as they became familiar with the form.

Another factor of which the researcher became aware while conducting the research was the great resistance to recording on the part of the staff. This made even more interesting the expressed enthusiasm for the experience of working with the recording form. This element of resistance was first expressed by the supervisors as one of the problems of the agency, and then later reiterated by the individual workers. One person said, "I greatly dislike recording", while others were even more pronounced in their opinions. "I hate writing." "I despise recording." Yet these same people later responded that they liked many aspects of the form.

What is the basis for the enthusiasm for the form? Looking generally over the data presented in chapter III some summarization can be made which points to the causes for the enthusiasm, particularly if these are considered in conjunction with the problems of recording discussed on pages 5 through 12 of this text. Perhaps the best means of relating the material is to examine the questions raised by the researcher which resulted in the study. These questions were originally raised on page 14.

CONCLUSIONS

Will use of the form in actuality increase the amount of time needed for recording?

Evidence from this study would reveal that recording time will not increase with the use of the form for recording. The groups of staff members who were able to use the form were in agreement that the form did not require too much time in relation to what they would like to spend on recording. Approximate time length for using the form was between thirty and forty-five minutes, and all participants of the study felt the time would decrease as familiarity with the form increased. The problem of time which was discussed by John Frings²⁸ would seem to be eliminated with use of the form. The relation of length of recording time and cost to the agency must also be considered as staff people previously involved in recording would now have time for other responsibilities of their position and thereby more work would be accomplished, and thus money put to a better use.

Is the form too simple or perhaps not clear enough?

In answering the question of simplicity of the form the categories of "understanding the information being sought" and the "detail of the form" would apply. In response to these questions, Groups B and C and one supervisor said there was some difficulty understanding the form. Groups A and C and one member of B felt the form was too detailed. The two questions became intertwined as the staff members spoke of

²⁸Frings, op. cit.

the redundancy of some items and confusion as to how the researcher defined terms. As previously mentioned the terms "hostility" and "conflict" in section IX and XI were seen as synonymous. Suggestions were made by three persons, all of different groups, that an orientation to the form would alleviate this problem. With such a discussion it would then be possible for the word "conflict" to also be seen as a situation wherein there simply existed differences of opinions. Thus, the form would seem to be unclear, but an orientation to the form would predictably alleviate this condition.

Will the beginning worker find the form easy to use?

Examination of the opinions of the members of Group B, which qualify as beginning workers, reveals that all its members wanted to use the form, and felt that problems of terminology could be eliminated. Thus beginning workers in this study showed a great deal of enthusiasm for the form. They commented that they could save time recording, could easily see the dynamics of a group, and could readily abstract salient information from the form. They also mentioned that the form provided a structure for recording, and that the form reduced their resistance to recording. Two supervisors (members of Group A) had stated that they would like to have their beginning workers use the form. Hence, the inference to be drawn is that beginning workers would find the form relatively easy to use. However, one limitation of the study is that all workers who used the form had at least a college degree, thus the form was not tested on workers with less formal levels of education.

Is the form too structured, thereby limiting the creativeness of the recorder?

In response to the question of the form limiting creativity of the recorder, reference can be made to the worker who used section VI, the business items of the meeting, merely as a guideline to write a narrative. One worker mentioned that the structure restricted him unless he did more summarizing. It is possible that the specific questions of the form would influence the recorder to deal only with them, however the form does not state that extra pages can not be used, nor that sections of the form must be used in a specific manner. Creativity need not be limited, but the worker must expend more effort in order to achieve it.

Will the structured form aid in the reduction of anxiety on the part of the worker in regards to recording?

The answer to the question of the form aiding in the reduction of a worker's recording anxiety, which also deals with one of the problems of recording,²⁹ can be gleaned from comments made by the staff that using the form would decrease their resistance and/or hostility to recording, and from comments concerning the ease of use of the form. As was revealed by Table 14, the participants' responses to the question, "Why would you like to use the form?", centered in two areas: (1) that the form afforded direction, and (2) that it decreased recording resistance. Also, as was previously mentioned, the enthusiastic reaction in favor of the form on the part of people who before using it had given negative

²⁹Babcock, op. cit.

responses would indicate that using the form at least set a more positive atmosphere for learning from recording.

Would using the form aid the worker in seeing more clearly his role with the group, and in understanding the group dynamics, thereby increasing the worker's level of awareness?

Many of the items on the interview schedule (used in enlisting opinions of the recording form) relate to the question of the form aiding the worker to see the internal makeup of the group and his role with the group. All ten of the participants responded that the form would help them in their work with groups, however, the section of the recording instrument concerned with the focus of the worker's attention did not receive complete agreement. One person did not feel that it helped him focus on individual behavior patterns. None of the supervisors (Group A) and only one member of Group B believed that the form would help them focus on the relations of members to each other. Only one person felt the form directed attention to the relation of the group to the community. Eight of the ten people agreed that the form helped to pinpoint planning for future meetings. All members stated that the form would aid in evaluating the group's movement and only one person disagreed that it would not help him in evaluating his own role. Thus it would seem that on the whole the form would help a worker to identify his role and to understand the dynamics of the group. The researcher, however, does not feel that the present research effort was exhaustive enough to predict the recording form's effect upon the worker's level of awareness of himself and group dynamics due to the short period of time the form was utilized.

How can the form be changed to make it a more effective tool for the worker?

Considering the suggestions made by the participants in the study, the researcher has revised the recording form as follows:

1. Within section I, which is concerned with characteristics of the group and of the meeting, an item would be added pertaining to the weather conditions at the time of the meeting. As weather can definitely affect the attendance and mood of the meeting, this would be essential to recording a meeting.
2. A separate attendance sheet will replace the attendance items in section II of the form. Maintaining a separate attendance sheet will alleviate repeated listings of group members' names as the form would require.
3. Replacing the attendance items of section II would be items calling for the purpose and goals of the meeting. Maintaining an account of the purpose and goals of a meeting will induce continuity to a staff member's work, aid him in evaluations, and help him to see his role with a group.
4. Section III, concerned with the tone of the meeting, would be expanded with provision for the worker's explanation of his answer in a "Comments" item.
5. Section VI, the business items of the meeting, would be extended over two pages to provide more space and to enable a worker to relate dynamics of the meeting.

This would increase the form's value as an educational tool.

6. An "Activity" item would be added to section VI so that possible relationships between subjects discussed and the activity taking place would be recorded.
7. Section XIII, which deals with the role of the worker with the group, would be extended with an "Other" category for workers who do not see themselves in any of the roles listed.
8. "Comments" in section XIII would be changed to "Evaluation" to provide for the worker's evaluation of his role.
9. Section XVII, the "Worker's plan for the next meeting," would be placed at the end of the form so that the worker could see the logical step into preparation for the coming meeting.
10. The form would be contained on both sides of a page to eliminate bulk and save money.

(Refer to Appendix III.)

Although many comments of "redundancy" were made in regards to sections VII through XII, the researcher has not altered these sections. They deal with individual behavior, internal makeup of the group, and the worker's role in all the situations therein recorded. These are seen as very vital to increasing the worker's level of awareness of himself and of group dynamics. The terms used in the sections will also serve to increase discussion in supervision sessions as the terms are defined.

What would be the effect of the form upon supervision?

Most of the respondents felt using the form would increase discussion in supervision sessions. This is in concurrence with the results of experiments with brief recording conducted by caseworkers.³⁰ One supervisor commented that it would make supervision easier as the form would enable him to see the directions in which to work with the staff members. Here, again, however, there was not adequate time utilizing the form to measure its effect upon supervision, although the opinions of the staff members would provide the basis for further research.

Would use of the form facilitate the organization of a worker's records?

All ten respondents replied positively to this question. Again, this was an opinion and can not be validated except over a period of use.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this exploratory study was to determine the possibilities of employing the structured recording form in the methods of social group work and community organization. Opinions were gathered from ten staff members of one agency who had access to the form and implemented it in their recording duties as staff members. On the whole, the participants in the study showed a great deal of enthusiasm for the form, and thus the prospects of employing the form as revised (See Appendix III.) is seen as very high,

³⁰Goodman, op. cit.

particularly in view of the great resistance to recording expressed by the staff members. Conclusions drawn from the study further support this statement. These conclusions are listed as follows:

1. Use of the recording form will not exceed sixty minutes for recording a meeting.
2. The time required to record using the form will decrease as familiarity with the form increases.
3. The greatest amount of difficulty encountered in understanding the form will be experienced by workers with the least amount of formal training.
4. Beginning workers will find the form relatively easy to use.
5. The form will not necessarily limit the creativity of the worker using it.
6. Use of the structured form would reduce a worker's anxiety in the area of recording.
7. Use of the form would help a worker to identify his role and enhance his understanding of group dynamics.
8. Discussion in supervision sessions would be increased following use of the form.
9. The organization of a worker's records would be facilitated as a result of using the form.

The respondents in this study were in agreement that the recording form would decrease their resistance toward recording. This is significant in light of the problems of recording delineated in chapter I of this study. Considering the purpose of recording of ". . . improving the quality of experience which is provided for a person(s), as it is to be used as a tool in aiding the worker to understand the person(s) with whom he is working and to understand how to help them,"³¹

³¹Trecker, op. cit., p. 203.

the form increases in importance as ease of use and lowering of resistance would greatly improve the probability of a worker learning from his recording and thereby increasing in his competence as a staff member. The recording form must also definitely be considered as a source of limiting the problems of recording time and cost to an agency.

The conclusions previously listed are in need of further research of a more extensive nature which would more adequately measure the effectiveness of the recording instrument used in this study. Research is also called for in such areas as the usefulness of the form among different agencies, between community organizers and group workers, in increasing the workers' levels of awareness of their roles and of group dynamics, and so forth. Another area needing research is the testing of the form on workers with less formal levels of education as all participants in the study had at least a college degree.

Total No. Pages _____

Record No. _____

Page No. _____

(Agency Name)

I. Group Meeting Report

Worker: _____

Date: _____

Group : _____

Kind: _____

Ages: _____

Number enrolled: _____ Number attending: _____ Visitors: _____

Time meeting started: _____ Time meeting ended: _____

Where the meeting was held: _____

II. Attendance List

People attending and order in which they arrived: (Note time of late arrivals.)

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1.		11.	
2.		12.	
3.		13.	
4.		14.	
5.		15.	
6.		16.	
7.		17.	
8.		18.	
9.		19.	
10.		20.	

III. The general tone of today's meeting seemed to be:

Tense _____	Hostile _____	Enthusiastic _____	Other _____
Restless _____	Depressed _____	Happy _____	
Excited _____	Congenial _____	Relaxed _____	

IV. The group seemed to be feeling:

More "Togetherness" _____	No Change _____
Less "Togetherness" _____	Don't Know _____

V. What sub-groups were in evidence at today's session? List in order of influence starting with the most influential.
(Example: Alice and Mary)

1.	<u>Comment</u>
----	----------------

2.

3.

4.

Don't Know: _____

No apparent sub-groups: _____

Record No. _____

Page No. _____

VI.

The order and subjects discussed at today's session, and how it worked out in the group:

Subject: Initiated by: Participation: Decision Made: How Arrived At: Your Role:

VII. Was there conflict between or among members? _____

What kind? _____ Around what issue? _____

People involved? _____ How settled? _____

Your role? _____

VIII. Was there any hostility apparent? _____ What kind? _____

Around what issue? _____ By whom? _____

What gave rise to this? _____

How settled? _____

Your role? _____

IX. Who took the most active part in the meeting? _____

At all times? _____ Explain _____

Your role? _____

X. Who was the most withdrawn? _____

At all times? _____ Explain _____

Your role? _____

XI. Who took leadership? _____ In what particular situations? _____

How? _____

Your role? _____

XII. Was there a feeling of being in a group? _____

Why? _____

Your role? _____

Did anyone try to produce this feeling among the group? _____

When? _____

How? _____

Why? _____ Your role? _____

XIII. For the following questions check what seems to be the most appropriate answers, and make any additional comments to illustrate your answer:

My role or roles, with the group, in today's session seemed to be:

- A. Arbitrator _____ Companion _____ COMMENTS
Teacher _____ Initiator _____
Policeman _____ Outsider _____
Benevolent Ruler _____ Enabler _____
- B. Detached Observer _____
Participated Somewhat _____
Participated Fairly Often _____
Very Active Participant _____
- C. Don't Know _____ Other _____

XIV. In relation to some of the individuals in the group, I played a special role, as follows:

<u>Name of Individual</u>	<u>Role of Individual</u>	<u>Role of Worker</u>
---------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------

XV. Were there some marked differences in the way some members accepted you? Explain.

XVI. To what other groups in the community is this group related?

Group Name

How are they related?

XVII. Worker's plan for the next meeting - What is it?

A. Who is going to be contacted between meetings and why?
Name Why?

B. Who is going to contact absent members?

XVIII. Comments, Evaluation, Assessment of the Meeting:

A. The questions which I am now going to ask you are concerned with your experience --

1. What is your position in the agency? _____

2. What is the extent of your education? (Check the item which best applies.)

Title of Degree(s):

grade school _____ college _____

high school _____ graduate school _____

3. How long have you worked with Bethlehem Community Center? (Check the item which best applies.)

0- 6 months (1/2 year) _____ 37-42 months (3 1/2 year) _____

7-12 months (1 year) _____ 43-48 months (4 year) _____

13-18 months (1 1/2 year) _____ 49-54 months (4 1/2 year) _____

19-24 months (2 year) _____ 55-60 months (5 year) _____

25-30 months (2 1/2 year) _____ 61- + months (5 + year) _____

31-36 months (3 year) _____

4. How long have you been working within the field of social work? (Check the item which best applies.)

0- 6 months (1/2 year) _____ 37-42 months (3 1/2 year) _____

7-12 months (1 year) _____ 43-48 months (4 year) _____

13-18 months (1 1/2 year) _____ 49-54 months (4 1/2 year) _____

19-24 months (2 year) _____ 55-60 months (5 year) _____

25-30 months (2 1/2 year) _____ 61- + months (5 + year) _____

31-36 months (3 year) _____

5. How long have you been working with groups in the field of social work? (Check the answer which best applies.)

0- 6 months (1/2 year) _____ 37-42 months (3 1/2 year) _____

7-12 months (1 year) _____ 43-48 months (4 year) _____

13-18 months (1 1/2 year) _____ 49-54 months (4 1/2 year) _____

19-24 months (2 year) _____ 55-60 months (5 year) _____

25-30 months (2 1/2 year) _____ 61- + months (5 + year) _____

31-36 months (3 year) _____

6. Are you presently working with at least one group? Yes___ No___
7. Were you able to record a meeting using the form? Yes___ No___
- If yes, were you able to record at least two meetings of one group? Yes___ No___

B. The following questions are concerned with time spent recording meetings. "Meetings" refers to those of committees, groups, councils, clubs, et cetera - at least more than two people are present.

1. How much time did you usually spend (or have you spent) recording a meeting with the agency form of recording?

0-30 minutes (1/2 hour)___	121-150 minutes (2 1/2 hour)___
31-60 minutes (1 hour)___	151-180 minutes (3 hour)___
61-90 minutes (1 1/2 hour)___	181-210 minutes (3 1/2 hour)___
91-120 minutes(2 hour)___	211-240 minutes (4 hour)___
	241- + minutes (4 + hour)___

2. How much time do you feel should be spent recording a typical group meeting?

0-30 minutes (1/2 hour)___	121-150 minutes (2 1/2 hour)___
31-60 minutes (1 hour)___	151-180 minutes (3 hour)___
61-90 minutes (1 1/2 hour)___	181-210 minutes (3 1/2 hour)___
91-120 minutes(2 hour)___	211-240 minutes (4 hour)___
	241- + minutes (4 + hour)___

3. How much time did you spend (or do you think you would spend) recording a meeting using the form? (Refer to copy attached.)

0-30 minutes (1/2 hour)___	121-150 minutes (2 1/2 hour)___
31-60 minutes (1 hour)___	151-180 minutes (3 hour)___
61-90 minutes (1 1/2 hour)___	181-210 minutes (3 1/2 hour)___
91-120 minutes(2 hour)___	211-240 minutes (4 hour)___
	241- + minutes (4 + hour)___

4. Do you feel that the attached form required (or do you feel that it would require) too much time in relation to the amount of time you would realistically like to spend on a recording?

Yes ___

No ___

C. This section of questions is concerned more with your feelings about the recording form --

1. Did you have difficulty understanding what information was being sought on the form?

Yes ____ No ____

If yes, which section(s) were hard to understand?

Section I	____	Section VII	____	Section XIII	____
Section II	____	Section VIII	____	Section XIV	____
Section III	____	Section IX	____	Section XV	____
Section IV	____	Section X	____	Section XVI	____
Section V	____	Section XI	____	Section XVII	____
Section VI	____	Section XII	____	Section XVIII	____

2. Do you feel that the form is too detailed? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, what section(s) would you dismiss or condense?
(Mark "C" for condense; "D" for dismiss.)

Section I	____	Section VII	____	Section XIII	____
Section II	____	Section VIII	____	Section XIV	____
Section III	____	Section IX	____	Section XV	____
Section IV	____	Section X	____	Section XVI	____
Section V	____	Section XI	____	Section XVII	____
Section VI	____	Section XII	____	Section XVIII	____

(For those which the person wants to condense, make notations on the attached recording form.)

3. Do you feel that using this form would help you in your work with the group(s)?

Yes ____ No ____

4. Would use of this form facilitate the organization of your records?

Yes ____ No ____

5. Did the use of the form (or do you feel it would) help you to focus on:

- a.) behavior patterns of individual members? Yes ____ No ____
- b.) relations of members to each other? Yes ____ No ____
- c.) relation of the group(s) to the community? Yes ____ No ____
- d.) planning for future meetings with the group(s)? Yes ____ No ____

6. Does the form cover all aspects of a meeting which you usually record?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, please explain what aspects are not covered _____

7. Does the form cover all aspects of a meeting which you feel should be recorded?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, what aspects do you feel should be covered? _____

8. Do you feel using this form would aid you in evaluating:

a.) the group(s) movement? Yes _____ No _____

b.) your role? Yes _____ No _____

9. Would you change the form? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, how? _____

10. Assuming that you are working with a group, would you like to use this recording form, if possible, for your recording?

Yes _____ No _____

Why? _____

(Factors to pull from the person: time, anxiety, structure.)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

Total No. Pages _____

Record No. _____

Page No. _____

(Agency Name)
Group Meeting Report

I. Worker: _____ Date: _____

Group : _____ Kind: _____ Ages: _____

Number enrolled: _____ Number attending: _____ Visitors: _____

Time meeting started: _____ Time meeting ended: _____

Where the meeting was held: _____

Weather conditions: _____

II. What was the purpose of today's meeting? What were the goals for the meeting?

III. The general tone of today's meeting seemed to be:

Tense _____	Hostile _____	Enthusiastic _____	Other _____
Restless _____	Depressed _____	Happy _____	<u>Comments</u>
Excited _____	Congenial _____	Relaxed _____	

IV. The group seemed to be feeling:

More "Togetherness" _____ No Change _____

Less "Togetherness" _____ Don't Know _____

V. What sub-groups were in evidence at today's session? List in order of influence starting with the most influential. (Example: Alice & Mary)

1. Comment

2.

3.

4.

Don't Know: _____ No apparent sub-groups:

Record No.

Page No.

VI.

The order and subjects discussed at today's session, and how it worked out in the group:

Subject: Initiated by: Participation: Decision Made: How Arrived At: Your Role:

Activity:

Record No. _____

Page No. _____

Activity:

VI.
The order and subjects discussed at today's session, and how it worked out in the group:
Subject: Initiated by: Participation: Decision Made: How Arrived At: Your Role:

VII. Was there conflict between or among members? _____
What kind? _____ Around what issue? _____
People involved? _____ How settled? _____
Your role? _____

VIII. Was there any hostility apparent? _____ What kind? _____
Around what issue? _____ By whom? _____
What gave rise to this? _____
How settled? _____
Your role? _____

IX. Who took the most active part in the meeting? _____
At all times? _____ Explain _____

Your role? _____

X. Who was the most withdrawn? _____
At all times? _____ Explain _____

Your role? _____

XI. Who took leadership? _____ In what particular situations? _____

How? _____
Your role? _____

XII. Was there a feeling of being in a group? _____
Why? _____
Your role? _____
Did anyone try to produce this feeling among the group? _____
When? _____
How? _____
Why? _____ Your role? _____

XIII. For the following questions check what seems to be the most appropriate answers, and make any additional comments to illustrate your answer:

My role or roles, with the group, in today's session seemed to be:

A. Arbitrator _____ Companion _____ EVALUATION

Teacher _____ Initiator _____

Policeman _____ Outsider _____

Benevolent Ruler _____ Enabler _____
Other _____

B. Detached Observer _____

Participated Somewhat _____

Participated Fairly Often _____

Very Active Participant _____

C. Don't Know _____ Other _____

XIV. In relation to some of the individuals in the group, I played a special role, as follows:

<u>Name of Individual</u>	<u>Role of Individual</u>	<u>Role of Worker</u>
---------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------

XV. Were there some marked differences in the way some members accepted you? Explain.

XVI. To what other groups in the community is this group related?

Group Name

How are they related?

XVII. Comments, Evaluation, Assessment of the Meeting:

XVIII. Worker's plan for the next meeting - What is it?

A. Who is going to be contacted between meetings and why?

B. Who is going to contact absent members?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Biddle, William W., and Biddle, Loureide J. The Community Development Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965, 138-145.
- Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: The Dryden Press, Part I, 1951.
- Lindsay, Anne. Group Work Recording. New York: Woman's Press, 1952.
- McMillen, Wayne. Community Organization for Social Welfare. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- Polansky, Norman A. Social Work Research. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Trecker, Harleigh B. Social Group Work. New York: Whiteside, Inc., 1955.
- Wilson, Gertrude, and Ryland, Gladys. Social Group Work. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949.

Articles and Periodicals

- Babcock, Charlotte G. "Social Work as Work," Social Casework, XXV (December, 1953), 415-422.
- Connery, Maurice F. "The Measure of Effective Recording," Social Casework, XXXV (December, 1954), 445-448.
- Dailey, Wilda J., and Hogan, Virginia Pettit. "Brief Recording and Supervision," Social Casework, XXXIX (May, 1958), 278-282.
- Dwyer, Margaret, and Urbanowski, Martha. "Student Process Recording: A Plea for Structure," Social Casework, XXXVI (May, 1965), 282-286.
- Frings, John. "Experimental Systems of Recording," Social Casework, XXXVIII (February, 1957), 55-63.

- Goodman, Nathaniel. "The Use of the Movement Scale With Brief Recording," Social Casework, XXXIX (May, 1958), 282-286.
- Hill, John G., and Ormsby, Ralph. "The Philadelphia Time-Cost Study in Family Service," The Social Welfare Forum 1953. New York: Columbia University Press, 205-226.
- Merrifield, A. R. "New Recording System for Medical Settings," Social Casework, XXXXI (May, 1960), 283-286.
- McNeil, C. F. "Community Organization for Social Welfare," Social Welfare Yearbook 1954, XII, (1954), 121-128.
- Murphy, Campbell G. "Community Organization Recording," Community Organization in Action. New York: Association Press, 1959, 303-305.
- "Of Records and Supervision," Social Service Review, XXVIII (March, 1954), 83-84.

Reports

- National Institute of Labor Education Mental Health Program. The Indigenous Nonprofessional. Report Number 3. November, 1964.

Unpublished Material

- Bethlehem Community Center. "Charter and Bylaws." Atlanta, Georgia, 1965. Revised. (Mimeographed.)
- Shearer, Darleen. "Community Organization: Definition." Atlanta, Georgia, 1966. (Typewritten.)